

### **Remarks**


In an Office Action mailed November 12, 2003, on prior copending utility application 10/323,072 filed December 18, 2002, the Examiner found the original claims to be directed to patentably distinct species Species 1, Figures 1a and 10b (claims 1-26) and Species II, Figures 11a to 12b (claims 27-44). In accordance with this finding, the Examiner required the applicant to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits. In an amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.111 filed February 9, 2004, Applicants affirmed an election of Species I, without traverse.

This preliminary amendment is made under 37 C.F.R. §1.115 with respect to the divisional application of copending application 10/323,072 and is filed concurrently therewith. The divisional application is directed to the non-elected species of the prior application, i.e., Species II.

It is therefore respectfully requested that this preliminary amendment be entered.

Respectfully submitted,

**PATRICK B. USORO, et al.**

By   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Christopher W. Quinn  
Reg. No. 38,274  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: 2/9/04

**QUINN LAW GROUP, PLLC**  
38701 W. Seven Mile Rd., Ste. 295  
Livonia, MI 48152  
Phone: 734-838-0777  
Fax: 734-838-0779